

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400

W8b

May 4, 2001

TO: COMMISSIONERS AND INTERESTED PERSONS

FROM: Peter Douglas, Executive Director
Tami Grove, Deputy Director
Elizabeth Fuchs, Coastal Program Manager

SUBJECT: Review of LCP Review Priorities and Selection of the Next Periodic LCP Review.

Under the CZMA Section 309 federal grant that is supporting Regional Cumulative Assessments and Periodic LCP review work, the next Periodic LCP review is not scheduled to begin until later in the fall under the FY 01/02 work program. Prior to initiating the next review, Commission staff will need to coordinate with local government staff on schedule, process and local financial assistance in order to maximize the ability of the local government to participate. However, there are some initial tasks, such as training district staff, and collecting permit and mapping data that can begin this summer with potential summer internship assistance. In order to begin this specific data collection in advance of the next Periodic LCP Review, it is necessary for the Commission to identify the LCP to be reviewed next.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission select San Mateo County, for the next LCP Periodic Review.

Discussion

In December 1998, the Commission formally adopted the following jurisdictions as the top five priorities for review:

1. San Luis Obispo County (in progress)
2. Monterey County
3. Santa Barbara County
4. San Mateo County
5. Mendocino County

The 2000 Budget Act directed Commission staff to prepare a Supplemental Report grouping all the LCPs overdue for review into two or more ranks indicating their priority, based on the relative impact on the goals of the Coastal Act. As required, this report was completed in January 2001. In expanding the higher priorities for LCP Review the Commission staff considered the following factors for each local LCP jurisdiction:

- 1) they include areas which in December 1998 the Commission formally adopted as high priority;

- 2) they may have a high level of post-certification permit and appeals activity;
- 3) they may contain critical coastal resource management issues;
- 4) they may be faced with high growth and development pressures or,
- 5) they may have LCP policies and standards which are most out of date.

Based on those criteria and current information available about the level of complexity of the LCP issues, Commission staff suggested the following three rankings in the report.

Rank 1: Higher Priority LCPs:

North Coast District

Del Norte County
Humboldt County
Mendocino County
City of Fort Bragg

South Central Coast District

Santa Barbara County
Ventura County

South Coast District

Los Angeles County/2 of 5 segments

North Central Coast District

City of Half Moon Bay
San Mateo County

San Diego Coast District

City of Carlsbad
City of San Diego

Central Coast District

Santa Cruz County
Monterey County
City of Marina
City of San Diego
San Luis Obispo County

Rank 2: Medium Priority LCPs: These include LCPs with significant, but generally less complex, coastal resource management issues than those in high priority areas. They also appear to have less post-certification permitting and appeals activity.

North Coast District District

City of Crescent City
City of Eureka
City of Point Arena

South Central Coast

City of Santa Barbara
City of San Buenaventura
City of Oxnard
City of Pt. Hueneme

North Central Coast District

Marin County
City of Pacifica
Sonoma County

South Coast District

City of Manhattan Beach
City of Long Beach
Orange County
City of Huntington Beach
City of Laguna Beach
City of Laguna Niguel
City of Dana Point

Central Coast District

City of Santa Cruz
City of Capitola
City of Watsonville
City of Morro Bay
City of Pismo Beach

San Diego Coast District

City of Coronado

Rank 3: Lower Priority LCPs: These are areas where the coastal management issues raised are usually less complex than those of the Rank 2 LCPs. These areas also have a lower number of permit and appeals .

North Coast District

City of Trinidad
City of Arcata

North Central Coast District

City of San Francisco

Central Coast District

City of Grover Beach

South Central Coast District

City of Carpinteria

South Coast District

City of El Segundo
City of Palos Verdes Estates
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
City of Avalon
City of Irvine

San Diego Coast District

City of Oceanside
City of National City
City of Chula Vista
City of Imperial Beach

The Supplemental Report also recommended a staff complement of 16 positions statewide to support these priorities in addition to the 4 positions funded under the Commission's projected federal Section 309 grant. However, at this time the only staffing resources currently provided for undertaking an LCP Review are provided through the federal grant and 2 positions in the Commission's budget (1 position in Central Coast and 1 position in North Coast) . Given the existing staff resources, it is therefore only possible to work on one higher priority, complex review at a time. In the event additional staff are available in the future, the Commission can initiate additional reviews and staff would return to the Commission for an updating of the priority ranking(s).

San Mateo County Selection

There are several compelling reasons to conduct a periodic review of San Mateo County's LCP.

Age of LCP

It is one of the older LCPs, having been approved by the County Board of Supervisors in August 1980 and certified by the Commission in April 1981. It has been amended numerous times since then (32 times as counted through 1998). San Mateo County also has had significant post-certification appeal activity. It has one of the highest overall numbers of appeals (44 through Feb 01). (See Table 1.) Of the appealable permits issued since certification, 6 % of these have been appealed. Of these projects appealed, the Commission has found substantial issue in about 36% of the cases.

Significant Resource Issues

Most recently, some of the significant issues raised in appeals have concerned the cumulative impacts of growth, particularly effects on coastal resources and public access. Issues raised most often in the appeals in San Mateo are related to the concentration/location and intensity of development, capacity of infrastructure, scenic and visual resources, landform alteration and

hazards. The core urban area of the San Mateo coast includes both incorporated and unincorporated areas. As available resources allow, because issues related to concentration of development have been raised so often, it would appear prudent for the Commission to also evaluate aspects of the adjoining LCP of the City of Half Moon Bay in order to address cumulative impacts.

Ongoing LCP Grant Program

San Mateo County has also received LCP grant funding to partially update their LCP. The grant, awarded in December 2000, is to partially fund an update of the County's LCP for the mid-Coast area that extends from just north of the City of Half Moon Bay to just south of the City of Pacifica. The project includes the evaluation of existing LCP policies and current Mid-Coast land use issues and the development of appropriate LCP amendments. The County work on the overall project is currently underway. With this concurrent work, undertaking a Periodic Review of the County's LCP should help increase the chance of implementing recommendations through anticipated LCP Amendments flowing from the update efforts. In addition, the County itself has undertaken significant planning studies in the recent past that could contribute to the Periodic Review. For example, the Countywide Transportation Plan, the Mid-Coast Incorporation/Annexation Fiscal Study, and the Coastside Subregional Planning Project as identified in the LCP Grant application. The City of Half Moon Bay was also awarded a grant in December 2000 to partially fund an update of their Land Use Plan and this planning effort would contribute to the Periodic Review.

Other Considerations

Conducting the review in San Mateo County will focus additional resources in another area of the state with significant coastal resources and where no LCP review has yet taken place. To date, prior federally funded Regional Cumulative Assessment Projects and Periodic Reviews have been undertaken in the Central Coast District and the South Central Coast District. Undertaking the review of the San Mateo LCP will provide the ability to examine issues from a different region of the coast. And as a result of the Periodic Reviews/ ReCAP, in addition to the analysis and recommendations in the report that can contribute to future permit and LCP actions, the North Central District would receive some collateral benefits similar to those received in the South Central and Central Coast Districts. These include electronic capture of substantial historical local permit data and development of GIS data and tools that can be used in subsequent permit and appeal reviews.

Attachment: Supplemental Report of the 2000 Budget Act

California Coastal Commission
Staff Report on Selection of Next LCP Review
05/04/01

Table 1:
Appeals where Substantial Issued Found¹

Jurisdiction	year certified	Appealable cdps filed thru 12/00 ²	Number of Appeals acted on through 2/01	% of appealable cdps which have been appealed	Number of appeals where Substantial Issue found	% of appeals where SI Found
San Luis Obispo County	1987	2265	64	3%	24	38%
Monterey County	1988	1124	44	4%	9	20%
San Mateo County	1981	757	44	6%	16	36%
Santa Barbara County	1982	1730	43	2%	10	23%
Santa Cruz County	1983	984	37	4%	12	32%
City of San Diego	1988	331	35	11%	14	40%
Mendocino County	1992	622	31	5%	17	55%
Pismo Beach	1984	445	26	6%	14	54%
Rancho Palos Verdes	1983	48	17	35%	6	35%
Imperial Beach	1984	164	16	10%	9	56%
Ventura County	1983	458	15	3%	3	20%
Morro Bay	1984	323	15	5%	12	80%
Long Beach	1981	446	15	3%	10	67%
Sonoma County	1981	139	15	11%	4	27%
Huntington Beach	1984	327	14	4%	9	64%
Laguna Beach	1993	143	14	10%	7	50%
Encinitas	1995	76	13	17%	7	54%
Humboldt County	1986	835	12	1%	3	25%
Santa Cruz City	1985	293	12	4%	7	58%
Fort Bragg	1988	132	9	7%	4	44%
Oceanside	1986	182	9	5%	5	56%
San Buenaventura	1984	459	9	2%	5	56%
Santa Barbara City	1986	160	8	5%		0%
Orange County	1983	115	7	6%	3	43%

¹ Source: Statewide Appeals Database of appeal actions through February 2001. Because data is compiled from CCC Agenda Meeting Results, it does not fully count the number of appeals filed but which have not appeared on a Commission agenda.

² Source: Semi-Annual Report to OCRM for period July-December 2000 on Post-Certification Permits Reported. Data through December 2000. Permits Reported may be undercounted due to lag in data entry into Post Certification Database and past logs.

California Coastal Commission
Staff Report on Selection of Next LCP Review
05/04/01

Jurisdiction	year certified	Appealable cdps filed thru 12/00²	Number of Appeals acted on through 2/01	% of appealable cdps which have been appealed	Number of appeals where Substantial Issue found	% of appeals where SI Found
Carpinteria	1982	61	7	11%	2	29%
Manhattan Beach	1995	92	7	8%	2	29%
LA County/Other	1990	33	6	18%	4	67%
Half Moon Bay	1996	47	6	13%	4	67%
Del Norte County	1983	819	6	1%	2	33%
Coronado	1984	68	6	9%	4	67%
Sand City	1984	21	6	29%	4	67%
Carlsbad	1980	46	5	11%	1	20%
Dana Point	1989	167	5	3%	1	20%
Marin County	1981	584	5	1%	3	60%
Oxnard	1985	84	5	6%	0	0%
Capitola	1990	120	4	3%	1	25%
Eureka	1984	224	4	2%	1	25%
Trinidad City	1980	116	4	3%	0	0%
Avalon	1981	25	4	16%	1	25%
Pacifica	1994	87	3	3%	1	33%
Crescent City	1983	31	2	6%	0	0%
Point Arena	1981	108	2	2%	0	0%
Marina	1982	33	2	6%	2	100%
San Francisco	1986	6	1	17%	0	0%
Chula Vista	1985	57	1	2%	1	100%
City of Long Beach	1981	446	1	0%	1	100%
Daly City	1984	3	1	33%	1	100%
Port Hueneme	1984	18	1	6%	0	0%
Palos Verdes Estates	1991	12	1	8%	0	0%
Grover Beach	1984	13	1	8%	1	100%

California Coastal Commission
Staff Report on Selection of Next LCP Review
05/04/01

Jurisdiction	year certified	Appealable cdps filed thru 12/00²	Number of Appeals acted on through 2/01	% of appealable cdps which have been appealed	Number of appeals where Substantial Issue found	% of appeals where SI Found
Certified but no appeals						
Watsonville	1988					
Crescent City	1983					
Arcata	1987					
Guadalupe	1991					
El Segundo	1982					
City of Irvine	1982					
City of Laguna Niguel	1990					
National City	1991					